



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/694,050	10/20/2000	Timothy Robert Weinstock	1017-6592	8576

21888 7590 10/29/2002

THOMPSON COBURN, LLP
ONE FIRSTAR PLAZA
SUITE 3500
ST LOUIS, MO 63101

EXAMINER

MORGAN, ROBERT W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/694,050

Applicant(s)

WEINSTOCK ET AL.

Examiner

Robert W. Morgan

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2002 and 29 July 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3626

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is in response to the amendments filed 7/9/02 and 7/29/02. Claims 51-68 have been added. Now claims 1-68 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-40, 45-46, 48 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,125,384 to Brandt et al., for the same reasons given in the previous Office Action (paper number 8).

(A) Claims 2-34, 36-40, 45-46, 48 and 50 have not been amended, and rejected for the same reason given in the previous Office Action (paper number 8), and incorporated herein.

(B) Claim 1 has been amended to merely change "location" to "locations", but otherwise does not affect the scope and breath of the claim as originally presented and/or in the manner in which the Examiner when applying prior art within the previous Office Action interpreted the claim.

As such, the recited claimed features of claim 1 are rejected for the same reasons given in the prior Office Action (paper number 8), incorporated herein.

Art Unit: 3626

(C) Claim 35 has been amended to now recite the step of “said computer software program providing”.

As per this limitation, Brandt teaches a rental vehicle system that includes access to the Internet with the purpose of renting a car using FlowMark application software. A user (multi-level organization) who wants to rent a car will access the WWW using a client workstation which is running a web browser (212, Fig. 2) entering the URL for the rental car agency and locate the home page site for the rental car agency (see: column 15, lines 22-37).

Brandt et al. fails to explicitly teach automatically accepting reservations for, and the said computer software program providing administrative control and accounting for, services offered and physically available at a plurality of geographically diverse locations.

It is well known in the car rental industry that rental agencies after reservation are confirmed on-line, have the capability to control billing and administrative functions surrounding a vehicle rental transaction such as the car availability at various locations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to include automatically accepting reservation using the said computer software program providing administrative control and accounting services within the FlowMark application software for car rental as taught by Brandt et al. with motivation of ensuring car availability and billing for the customer thereby expediting the process of make a reservation on-line.

Art Unit: 3626

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 41-44, 47 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,125,384 to Brandt et al., for the same reasons given in the previous Office Action (paper number 8).

(A) Claims 42-44, 47 and 50 have not been amended, and rejected for the same reason given in the previous Office Action (paper number 8), and incorporated herein.

(B) Claim 41 amended to merely add “plurality of”, but otherwise does not affect the scope and breath of the claim as originally presented and/or in the manner in which the Examiner when applying prior art within the previous Office Action interpreted the claim.

As such, the recited claimed features of claim 41 are rejected for the same reasons given in the prior Office Action (paper number 8), incorporated herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 51-57 and 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,125,384 to Brandt et al.

As per claim 51, Brandt et al. teaches an Internet enabled automatic rental vehicle reservation system, said system having an Internet web site for authorized purchaser to access a rental vehicle software program resident on a computer system, said rental vehicle software program having means for automatically responding to a series of commands from said authorized purchaser and communicating a rental vehicle reservation to a computer for one of a plurality of providers of said rental vehicle services, said rental vehicle service provider computer being programmed with an integrated business software having means for offering rental vehicles for filling said reservation, said rental vehicle software program having means for managing the authorizing, processing and billing of said rental vehicle reservation so that a rental vehicle reservation may be automatically processed thereby for at least said one rental vehicle service provider.

These limitations are met by the rental vehicle system that includes access to the Internet with the purpose of renting a car using FlowMark application software. This software allows an authorized user to enter car rental information through a rental car agency's web site form and a database searches is performed to locate car availability and the results are return to make

Art Unit: 3626

reservation (see: column 14, lines 53 to column 15, lines 37). In addition, if an available car match is made, then a confirmation number for the reservation is generated and transferred to the requester (see: column 15, lines 8-10). The confirmation number being transferred to the requester suggests to the Examiner that rental vehicle reservation is filled.

Brandt et al. fails to teach the claimed rental vehicle reservation information for managing the authorizing, processing and billing of said rental vehicle reservation so that a rental vehicle reservation may be automatically processed thereby for at least said one rental vehicle service provider.

Since Brandt et al. teaches the use of a rental agency's information form for the user that includes first name, middle initial, last name, origin city, state, start date, number of days and car preference of the user (see: column 15, lines 38-42), it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include accurate user information necessary to authorize, process and bill the user for the rental vehicle transaction within the FlowMark application software for car rental as taught by Brandt et al. with motivation of facilitating the rental agency with collecting dependable and reliable information thereby assisting the process of billing the customers.

As per claim 52, Brandt et al. teaches the claimed authorized purchaser comprises a business organization, said business organization having a plurality of authorized purchasers, said plurality of authorized purchasers being enabled to access said Internet web site from any location offering Internet web access, and wherein said at least one rental vehicle service provider further comprising a second business organization, said second business organization comprising a plurality of diverse rental vehicle locations.

Art Unit: 3626

These features are met by the rental vehicle system that includes access to the Internet with the purpose of renting a car using FlowMark application software. An authorized user (business organization) browses the Internet for rental car agencies (second business organization) to make a reservation for rent a car that is available at a suitable location (see: column 14, lines 53 to column 15, lines 37).

As per claim 53, Brandt et al. teaches the claimed rental vehicle software program has means for accepting a remotely initiated reservation and communicating it to the authorized purchasers for authorization (see: column 8, lines 51-59).

As per claim 54, Brandt et al. teaches the claimed rental vehicle software program has means for an authorized purchaser to modify said reservation. This feature is met by the ability of the authorized user to input and change information on the rental car agency's web site form regarding first name, middle initial, last name, origin city, state, start date, number of days and car preference of the user (see: column 15 lines 22-42).

As per claim 55, Brandt et al. teaches the claimed rental vehicle software program has means for an authorized purchaser to extend the authorization for said reservation. This feature is met by the ability of the authorized user to input and change information on the rental car agency's web site form regarding first name, middle initial, last name, origin city, state, start date, number of days and car preference of the user (see: column 15 lines 22-42).

As per claim 56, Brandt et al. teaches the claimed rental vehicle software program has means for an authorized purchaser to generate reports relating to reservation activity conducted through said rental vehicle software program. This limitation is met by the FlowMark application

Art Unit: 3626

software output data container, which includes car rental reservation information (see: column 14, lines 6-10 and lines 53-64).

As per claim 57, Brandt et al. teaches the claimed rental vehicle reservation system comprises a computer network having a main frame computer and wherein said rental vehicle service provider computer comprises a computer network having a main frame computer, said main frame computers being linked to each other, and wherein said second computer system further comprises a WAN (see: column 4, lines 60 to column 5, lines 7).

As per claim 62, Brandt et al. teaches a method for managing reservations placed between a first multi-level business organization purchaser and a plurality of service provider, at least one of said service providers comprising a multi-level business service provider organization, said multi-level business service provider having a computer system programmed with an integrated business software for fulfillment of said reservation, the method comprising:

--the claimed providing a computer system, said computer system being programmed with reservation management software having means for providing interact access thereto by said multi-level purchaser is met by the rental vehicle system that includes access to the Internet with the purpose of renting a car using FlowMark application software. This software allows an authorized user to enter car rental information through a rental car agency's web site form and a database searches is performed to locate car availability and the results are used to make a reservation (see: column 14, lines 53 to column 15, lines 37), and

--the claimed storing data for use by said reservation management software relating to the reservations processed is met by the FlowMark application software, which includes a database (438, Fig. 4) to store information relating to the rental car process (see: column 11, lines 6-12).

Art Unit: 3626

Brandt et al. fails to explicitly teach the stored data of said reservations including the invoicing and payment, and accepting reservations entered by said purchaser into said reservation management software and communicating at least some of them to the service provider's integrated business software for fulfillment.

It is well known in the car rental industry that rental agencies after reservation are confirmed on-line, have the capability to control billing and administrative functions including invoice and payment surrounding a vehicle rental transaction. In addition, Brandt et al. teaches the FlowMark application software, which includes a database (438, Fig. 4) to store information relating to the rental car process (see: column 11, lines 6-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to include storing reservation data regarding an invoice and payment as well as accepting the reservation within the FlowMark application software for car rental as taught by Brandt et al. with motivation of ensuring car availability, billing and confirmation for the customer thereby expediting the process of make a reservation on-line.

As per claim 63, Brandt et al. teaches the claimed step of enabling the purchaser to modify any reservation placed into said reservation management software. This feature is met by the ability of the authorized user to input and change information on the rental car agency's web site form regarding first name, middle initial, last name, origin city, state, start date, number of days and car preference of the user (see: column 15 lines 22-42).

As per claim 64, Brandt et al. teaches the claimed step of generating reports summarizing the reservations placed by a purchaser through said management software. This limitation is met

Art Unit: 3626

by the FlowMark application software output data container, which includes car rental reservation information (see: column 14, lines 6-10 and lines 53-64).

8. Claims 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,125,384 to Brandt et al. in view of Official Notice in further view of "Cendent's Real Estate Subsidiaries Create On-line Cross-Marketing Alliance With Rent Net; Coldwell Banker, Century 21 and ERA Join Forces With Sister Company, Rent Net" by Business Wire.

As per claim 58, Brandt et al. teaches the claimed computer software program having means for providing an Internet site for access by a multi-level business organization to a plurality of service providers including one such service providers having it own computer system programmed with managing service reservation placed to said service provider's integrated business software and for fulfillment thereby, said computer software program having means for managing reservation placed therethrough including administrative control and accounting for said reservations.

These limitations are met by the rental vehicle system that includes access to the Internet with the purpose of renting a car using FlowMark application software. A user (multi-level organization) who wants to rent a car will access the WWW using a client workstation which is running a web browser (212, Fig. 2) entering the URL for the rental car agency and locate the home page site for the rental car agency (see: column 15, lines 22-37).

Brandt et al. fails to explicitly teach automatically accepting reservations for, and provide administrative control and accounting for, services offered and physically available at a plurality of geographically diverse locations.

Art Unit: 3626

It is well known in the car rental industry that rental agencies after reservation are confirmed on-line, have the capability to control billing and administrative functions surrounding a vehicle rental transaction such as the car availability at various locations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to include automatically accepting reservation to provide administrative control and accounting services within the FlowMark application software for car rental as taught by Brandt et al. with motivation of ensuring car availability and billing for the customer thereby expediting the process of make a reservation on-line.

Brandt et al. also fails to explicitly teach an Internet site for access by a multi-level business organization to a plurality of service providers.

Business Wire teaches Rent Net (www.rent.net) which provides direct links to web sites such as CENTURY21, Coldwell Banker and ERA so customer can access rental information (see: paragraph 2). In addition, Business Wire teaches that Rent Net includes special moving-services area that complements its apartment listings and provides access to ancillary relocation service such as truck rental (see: paragraph 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the inventions was made to incorporate the direct links to different web sites as taught by Business Wire within the FlowMark application software for car rental as taught by Brandt et al. with motivation of establishing on-line relationships with numerous businesses to make to process of renting vehicles more efficient and less time consuming for the customer.

As per claim 59, Brandt et al. teaches the claimed computer software program has means for providing access to an authorized purchaser for placing said reservations, said authorized

Art Unit: 3626

purchaser comprising the multi-level business organization. This limitation is met by the rental vehicle system that includes access to the Internet with the purpose of renting a car using FlowMark application software. This software allows an authorized user (multi-level) to enter car rental information through a rental car agency's web site form, performed by any personal computer at home or business (see: column 14, lines 53 to column 15, lines 37).

As per claim 60, Brandt et al. teaches the claimed at least one service provider comprises a multi-level business organization, said computer software program having means for providing, communication between multiple levels of each business organization. Common Gateway Interface (CGI) of the FlowMark application software meets this limitation where the users must be authenticated by the web server application (see: column 11, lines 28-43).

As per claim 61, Brandt et al. teaches the claimed comprising a first computer network, said computer software being resident on said first computer network, a second computer network, said integrated business software being resident on said second computer network, each of said computer networks having a main frame computer, said main frame computers being linked to each other and wherein said second computer system comprises a WAN (see: column 4, lines 60 to column 5, lines 7).

9. Claims 65-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,125,384 to Brandt et al. in view of "Cendent's Real Estate Subsidiaries Create On-line Cross-Marketing Alliance With Rent Net; Coldwell Banker, Century 21 and ERA Join Forces With Sister Company, Rent Net" by Business Wire.

As per claim 65, Brandt et al. teaches an Internet enabled automatic rental vehicle reservation system, said system having an Internet web site through which an authorized

Art Unit: 3626

purchaser of rental vehicle services has access to said system, said system including a computer system programmed with a management software program, said management software program having means for receiving reservation for vehicle rental, said system having a link to a plurality of rental vehicle service provider including at least one service provider having an integrated business software program for processing fulfilling said reservations.

Brandt et al. fails to explicitly teach a system having a link to a plurality of rental vehicle service provider including at least one service provider having an integrated business software program for processing fulfilling said reservations.

Business Wire teaches Rent Net (www.rent.net) which provides direct links to web sites such as CENTURY21, Coldwell Banker and ERA so customer can access rental information (see: paragraph 2). In addition, Business Wire teaches that Rent Net includes special moving-services area that complements its apartment listings and provides access to ancillary relocation service such as truck rental (see: paragraph 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the inventions was made to incorporate the direct links to different web sites as taught by Business Wire within the FlowMark application software for car rental as taught by Brandt et al. with motivation of establishing on-line relationships with numerous businesses to make to process of renting vehicles more efficient and less time consuming for the customer.

As per claim 66, Brandt et al. fails to teach the claimed said management software has means for invoicing the reservations placed therethrough.

It is well known in the car rental industry that rental agencies after reservation are confirmed on-line, have the capability to control billing and administrative functions including

Art Unit: 3626

invoicing. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to include a means for invoicing a reservation within the FlowMark application software for car rental as taught by Brandt et al. with motivation of ensuring car availability and billing for the customer thereby expediting the process of make a reservation on-line.

As per claim 67, Brandt et al. teaches the claimed said management software has means the authorized purchaser to modify the reservations placed therethrough. This feature is met by the ability of the authorized user to input and change information on the rental car agency's web site form regarding first name, middle initial, last name, origin city, state, start date, number of days and car preference of the user (see: column 15 lines 22-42).

As per claim 68, Brandt et al. teaches the claimed said management software has means for generating reports summarizing the reservations placed by the authorized purchaser therethrough. This limitation is met by the FlowMark application software output data container, which includes car rental reservation information (see: column 14, lines 6-10 and lines 53-64).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 7/9/02 and 7/29/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments will be addressed hereinbelow in the order in which they appear in the response filed 7/9/02 and 7/29/02.

In the remarks, the Applicant argue in substance that, (1) Brandt et al. fails to teaches a rental car software application to provide for third party usage; (2) Brandt et al. teaches nothing about a separate "management software and hardware through which a business partner accesses,

Art Unit: 3626

operates and communicates with rental care provider; (3) Brandt et al. does not disclose or suggest a single “rental vehicle software program” capable of having a connection to different “legacy” car rental software programs for administrative control and accounting needed to accommodate high volume business-to-business operation; and (4) Brandt et al. fails to teach a system having a single web site through which a plurality of rental vehicle providers may be accessed.

(A) In response to Applicants argument that (1) Brandt et al. fails to teaches a rental car software application to provide for third party usage. The Examiner respectfully submits Brandt et al. teaches a FlowMark application software that allows an authorized user to enter car rental information through a rental car agency’s web site form and a database searches is performed to locate car availability and the results are return to make reservation (see: column 14, lines 53 to column 15, lines 37). The authorized user accesses the Internet (first party), using FlowMark application software (second party) and links to a rental car agencies web site (third party) to make the reservation. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the reference of Brandt clearly provides rental car software for third party usage.

(B) In response to Applicants argument that (2) Brandt et al. teaches nothing about a separate “management software and hardware through which a business partner accesses, operates and communicates with rental care provider. The Examiner respectfully submits the reference of Brandt et al. teaches the FlowMark application software where an authorized user (business organization) browses the Internet for rental car agencies (second business organization) to make a reservation for rent a car that is available at a suitable location (see: column 14, lines 53 to column 15, lines 37). In addition, Brandt et al. teaches the use of a rental

Art Unit: 3626

agency's information form for the user that includes first name, middle initial, last name, origin city, state, start date, number of days and car preference of the user (see: column 15, lines 38-42). This clearly indicates that an authorized user communicates with rental agencies using their information forms to make a reservation.

(C) In response to Applicants argument that (3) Brandt et al. does not disclose or suggest a single "rental vehicle software program" capable of having a connection to different "legacy" car rental software programs for administrative control and accounting needed to accommodate high volume business-to-business operation. The Examiner respectfully submits that although Brandt et al. fails to explicitly teach rental software programs for administrative control and accounting needed to accommodate high volume business-to-business operation. It is well known in the car rental industry that rental agencies after reservation are confirmed on-line, have the capability to control billing and administrative functions surrounding a vehicle rental transaction. The Examiner considers the FlowMark application software to include a means for administrative control and accounting and the courts have held that even if a patent does not specifically disclose a particular element, said element being within the knowledge of a skilled artisan, the patent taken in combination with that knowledge, would put the artisan in the possession of the claimed invention. *In re Graves*, 36 USPQ 2d 1697 (Fed. Cir. 195).

(D) In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a system having a single web site through which a plurality of rental vehicle providers may be accessed) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the

Art Unit: 3626

specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert W. Morgan whose telephone number is 703-605-4441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 703-305-9588. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.


Art Unit: 3626

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

RWM

rwm

October 20, 2002


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3800